



According to the DAUDS, the building edge includes everything on the outside of a building. Buildings must face the street with a maximum of five feet from the property line. Porches shall open to street for residential developments so that developments are not facing inward. Changes to the building façade should be consistent with original and existing architecture. In regards to parking garages, concepts such as ramping and ground level design must be designed for the possibility of future retail use. Windows or significant transparency is required at street level and there must be a differentiation between the first and second floor visible from street. Exterior façade lighting is encouraged and primary building entrances must be clearly visible with long facades broken up with either vertical or horizontal articulation. Walled off/fenced developments are not allowed. One exception can be fencing made of a quality transparent material, such as wrought iron no higher than 6-foot may be considered for private courtyards and/or parking. Restaurant and retail activity should be brought out to the sidewalk where possible.

Some standards apply specifically to the single family area in the southwest part of downtown. Due to the character of the area, the standard allows 4-foot sidewalks instead of 6-foot, setbacks consistent with prevailing setback, a maximum building height of two stories with consistent roof pitch. Front lawns shall not be paved.

The closing or vacation of streets is highly discouraged. However, if a street must be vacated the street shall remain open to pedestrians. Drive-thru facilities with the exception of bank drive-thrus are not allowed. The majority of businesses that have a drive-thru feature also have designs to adapt to a downtown urban environment.

Parking structures need to incorporate architectural appearances with the use of corner elements, using landscape architectural features to soften the appearance of the façade and be visually appealing. Public parking lots must have landscaping with fencing of 3 – 4 foot in height and shall extend into the right-of-way with no more than one driveway per block façade.

Sign design will be determined by the surrounding architecture and shall be limited to the fewest number necessary to clearly identify the building. Most major sign styles are allowed in conjunction with architectural design with the following exceptions. Off-premise signs, rooftop signs except when replacing historical signage, standard box cabinet wall sign and supergraphics are not allowed. Way finding or directional signs will be encouraged to assist downtown patrons.

Board Member Kelly asked how these sign standards will affect the current sign ordinance. Ms. Dailey recommended downtown be exempt from the citywide Sign and Landscape Ordinances and adhere to the DAUDS requirements. Board Member Letson asked if these sign standards would be regulated and enforced as well.

Ms. Dailey confirmed this and stated owners and developers should review both the DAUDS and the Sign and Landscaping Ordinances for the correct requirements. She added that in her experience, developers want specific guidelines and by exempting downtown areas from citywide ordinances and developing standards specific to downtown allows for regulations which can be easily adhered to.

Chairman Brown summarized the TIRZ Board's involvement, by stating their task is to determine if the proposed DAUDS conform with the TIRZ Board initiatives and if so, support the proposed DAUDS for approval by the City Commission. The DAUDS will become in essence, an ordinance that the TIRZ Board will abide when considering funding a project Mr. Brown believes the broad cost impact of the various components of the DAUDS and whether or not the standard will help or hinder TIRZ participation are the main issues to be addressed. He suggests the discussion should focus primarily on how comfortable the TIRZ Board is with being able to conform to the proposed standards. The TIRZ Board can either recommend the adoption of the standards as proposed, or decide to study the proposal further. However, he reminded board members that the TIRZ Board is not responsible for zoning. The Board is being asked for a recommendation supporting the proposed standards to facilitate in the overall drafting process, not the approval process.

Council Member Bliss questioned who the DAUDS is aimed towards. Would this address only new development and redevelopment and would existing property aspects be grandfathered?

Ms. Dailey stated any existing component would be grandfathered, but as changes/additions become necessary, conformity to the new standards would be required. For example, if a property owner wants to put in a new sign, they do not have to conform to the complete DAUDS at that time, but must comply with the sign regulations.

Ms. Bliss concluded that all new developments/redevelopments would have to comply completely with the new standards, therefore creating a "hodge-podge" of street frontages for a period of time. For example, one business may have a bench or pedestrian lighting while the business next door might not have anything. All the same, the City would have an established design standard to work with as downtown development expands.

Ms. Dailey maintained all cities go through a period of inconsistency when a new set of standards is introduced.

Ms. Bliss asked about adherence to the DAUDS components such as pedestrian lighting or benches. Would they all be required to be the same?

Ms. Dailey explained it would depend on the element. Benches are encouraged but not required. There is a specific bench design suggested but could vary. However, there are certain facets which should remain uniform to maintain consistency, of which pedestrian lighting is one. In this case, the design would be standardized.

Ms. Bliss asked if the lighting would be 24 hours a day or within certain hours? Ms. Dailey answered the lighting is automated by light sensitivity.

Vice-Chairman Harpole stated that as a guest to some of the DAI meetings, he was able to watch some of the development progression. He said after seeing the effort expended by questioning, backing-up and modifying the proposals, he believes the proposed standards and TIRZ Board objectives are consistent and the Board should absolutely support it. He considers these standards excellent guidelines for downtown Amarillo, which will benefit the existing infrastructure as well as new development in the future. Several developers have inquired about guidelines for downtown developments and they want to know there will be consistency in the downtown design.

Council Member Blanchard said he thinks the Board has a responsibility to the entities they represent to study the proposed standards and suggested an ad hoc committee be created for that purpose. He feels there are property rights issues to be examined. Mr. Blanchard feels it would be imprudent to endorse them today and again suggested a committee be appointed to review the proposal and make a presentation at the next TIRZ Board meeting.

Mr. Norris added the proposed document had not been submitted for legal review. He thinks it is a great vision statement, however there are legal aspects which must be addressed and more detail work needed before submitting it to the City Commission for adoption. The City's Legal Department will work with DAI to put the proposal into the correct legal form and create clear, concise terminology to avoid misinterpretation as in the case of "quality material".

He stated he would consult with legal departments of cities that have adopted these types of design standards correctly and look at their ordinances to ensure the City of Amarillo's is prepared accurately. According to the current City Charter, all legal matters must be reviewed by the City's Legal Department.

Council Member Autry asked to review the approval process again and clarify the role of the TIRZ Board.

Ms. Dailey explained once the proposal has been finalized, it will be presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval and if approved, sent to the City Commission for final approval.

Chairman Brown said again this is a Zoning proposal the and TIRZ Board involvement is limited to recommendation only and is not involved in the approval process.

Ms. Autry asked once the City Commission approves the standard, will the TIRZ Board have to comply with these standards if it decides to fund a redevelopment project in the TIRZ zone. She also questioned how TIRZ Board participation in a project would be affected by the cost requirements of what is expected by the City.

Chairman Brown agrees this is a core issue for the Board Members to consider and confirmed once the City Commission approves the DAUDS, it will become an ordinance.

Ms. Dailey mentioned the way the DAUDS is written, the property owner would be responsible to comply with the standards, therefore TIRZ funding would be between the property owner and the TIRZ Board.

Ms. Bliss asked for clarification as to the cost of some of the components such as pedestrian lighting and irrigation for trees.

Ms. Dailey reminded the Board of the existing Landscape and Sign Ordinances, which are already being applied. For example, assuming a certain threshold and the property is worth \$100,000+ and \$50,000 or more is spent, the existing landscape requirements which includes irrigation must be met. Based on the existing requirements, the committee agreed the new downtown standards should not be substandard to those already required. The landscape and sidewalk requirements of the proposed standards are the same as the existing requirements. Pedestrian lighting, in particular, is the foremost cost additive.

Board Member Letson emphasized the importance of a walkable downtown, reinforcing the need for pedestrian lighting as a critical factor.

Board Member Proffer asked if there is a way for property owners to appeal approval.

All development projects that include changes or additions to walkway, landscape, building edge and/or signage are subject to review for the Planning Department or the Downtown Design Review Board (DDRB) for compliance. Projects that are clearly consistent with all applicable standards may be approved administratively. These include signage, landscape and street lighting, sidewalk construction, minor modifications to existing buildings, temporary construction facilities and historic restoration. All new construction, major modification of buildings, defined as improvements exceeding 50% of the existing building value as shown on the tax rolls and a minimum value of the improvement of \$50,000, items the Planning and Zoning Commission refer and cases that vary from standards must be presented to the DDRB for approval. Appeals of an administrative decision will be heard by the DDRB and appeals of the DDRB will be heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission. In both cases, the final decision will be offered there.

Mr. Blanchard stated that the Design Review Board consists basically of architectural, landscaping, design professionals. Ms. Dailey explained the committee member representation would consist of real estate, structural architecture, landscape architecture, urban design/planning professionals as well as a downtown business property owner and a downtown resident. Chairman Brown pointed out there are no City or TIRZ representatives. Ms. Dailey maintained that a City staff member should not serve on a City Board.

Mr. Norris added the appeal process is another issue the legal department would need to review. He stated under state law the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) exists for appeals in a specific jurisdiction which is then appealed to District Court, not to P&Z or City Commission. Mr. Norris suggested an actual draft of the ordinance be made available to review. The ordinance would include processes, substantive provisions and all of the proposed elements and details.

Chairman Brown asked for a motion to support the proposed DAUDS and declared if no motion is made, he will appoint a review subcommittee to work with the City's legal department and DAI and present recommendations at the next meeting focusing on TIRZ specific issues.

Ms. Autry asked for a hypothetical model generated for a building redevelopment with costs estimated using the existing ordinances vs. the proposed standards. Ms. Dailey explained the costs would vary dramatically depending on the project, the existing infrastructure and proposed redevelopment costs. Chairman Brown asked for a simple, generalized model for comparison purposes.

Ms. Covey suggested generating a mock-up development project, such as the development of a block or storefront on Polk Street, and doing a cost comparison based on existing standards against proposed standards. All costs should be based on the minimum requirements.

Chairman Brown, not hearing a motion to recommend the standards said he will appoint a subcommittee to review the proposal in more detail and report back to the TIRZ Board at their next meeting.

ITEM 3 Report on Status of Projects:

a. Barfield Building Project

Mr. Shaw reiterated the Barfield Amendment expires April 15, 2010. He expects to hear something prior to the next TIRZ meeting.

b. Fisk Courtyard by Marriott Redevelopment Project

Chairman Brown introduced Mr. Robert DeShay who thanked the TIRZ Board for their support. He expressed excitement about the progress of the project and the positive community feedback. He said they were looking forward to opening at the end of the year. Chairman Brown also recognized and thanked Mr. Daniel Patel for attending the TIRZ Board meeting and for his efforts in Amarillo. Mr. Patel presented a positive appraisal of the progress being made and anticipates an opening date of Thanksgiving 2010. He maintained the Fisk Courtyard will be a one-hundred year old building outside while being one of the most high-tech structures in downtown Amarillo inside.

Vice Chairman Harpole reported on the tour he took of the hotel. By incorporating the stairwells and what has been done with the structure of the other building. An amazing job has been done using the older structure to enhance the renovations. He expressed approval of the work that has been completed and is eager to see the completed project.

Chairman Brown thanked Mr. Patel for all the hard work and determination required for a project of this type during current economic times.

c. Double R Lofts

There was nothing to report.

d. Downtown Amarillo Inc. Consultant Planning Studies

There was nothing to report.

ITEM 4 Committee Reports

a. Marketing

There was nothing to report.

b. Hotel Development

Chairman Brown inquired about the status of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process.

Ms. Dailey reported there were eight responses to the RFQ from seemingly qualified development companies that have done this type of work before. The committee will review the RFQ responses and invite the most experienced firms to respond to the Request for Proposal (RFP). Ms. Dailey anticipates the process to be completed in approximately May 2010.

Chairman Brown asked if another firm were to attempt to submit an RFQ today, would they be considered in the process. Ms. Dailey stated they would be declined since the response date has passed.

Mr. Shaw added the committee has received several collaborative proposals in which a development team, a construction team, as well as other teams are incorporated into one. The RFQs were received from firms both in Texas and outside.

c. Subcommittee on Extensions

Did not meet.

ITEM 5 Public Comments

The Board can take no action on matters presented or discussed.

No one spoke.

§§§

There being no further items before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m. All remarks are recorded and are on file in the Planning Department.